



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,238	09/26/2003	Thomas J. Mohr	29014.0003/C	8576

27890 7590 07/28/2006

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

TOOMER, CEPHIA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/670,238	Applicant(s) MOHR, THOMAS J.	
	Examiner Cephia D. Toomer	Art Unit 1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 23-28, in the reply filed on May 15, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the subject matter of claims 1-28 is sufficiently related that a thorough and complete search of the subject matter of the elected claims would necessarily encompass a thorough and complete search for the subject matter of the non-elected claims. This is not found persuasive because a reference that anticipates or renders obvious a method of using radio frequency waves to imitate the presence of a catalyst and artificially create catalytic action in a catalyst-free chemical reaction or a method of using radio frequency waves to imitate the presence of inert metallic catalyst and artificially create catalytic action in a catalyst-free chemical reaction would not anticipate or render obvious super-oxygenated water or medicinal solutions containing super-oxygenated water. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 27-28 provide for the use of the super-oxygenated water, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it

Art Unit: 1714

merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz (US 6,228,259).

Schwartz teaches an oxygenated water cooler wherein the water cooler maintains the dissolved oxygen concentration of the bottled water at 25-125 mg/liter (see abstract and col. 2, lines 5-13).

Schwartz differs from the claims in that he does not specifically teach that the dissolved oxygen of his invention is dissolved oxygen atom. However, since Schwartz is silent regarding this limitation, it would be reasonable to expect that Schwartz's generic description of oxygen encompasses atomic oxygen.

Art Unit: 1714

5. Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zelenak (US 5,814,222).

Zelenak teaches super oxygenated water containing 40-50 mg/l of oxygen (see col. 3, lines 22-30). The water is used in medical solutions, such as organ transplant storage media and contact lens treating solution (saline) (see col. 3, lines 31-41).

Zelenak teaches the limitation of the claims other than that the oxygen of his invention is atomic oxygen. However, since Zelenak is silent regarding this limitation, it would be reasonable to expect that Zelenak's generic description of oxygen encompasses atomic oxygen.

6. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over OXY-WATER.

OXY-WATER teaches super-oxygenated water containing 34 mg/l of dissolved oxygen (see testimonials-medical statements).

OXY-WATER differs from the claims in that it does not specifically teach that the oxygen of its invention is atomic oxygen. However, since OXY-WATER is silent regarding these limitations, it would be reasonable to expect that OXY-WATER's generic description of oxygen encompasses atomic oxygen.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1714

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Cepha D. Toomer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

10670238\20060724